

Application No.: 09/965,646  
Response to Office Action of 07/31/2003  
Attorney Docket: DYKIN-014A

### REMARKS

In the Final Office Action dated Feb. 19, 2004 the Examiner allowed Claims 5-11 and 21 and found Claim 29 as allowable if rewritten to resolve §112 objections and to incorporate features from the intervening claims. The remaining claims were rejected on Moore.

Rejected Claims 30-33 are deleted. Claim 29 is amended. Reconsideration of Claim 20 and its dependent Claims 21-29 is respectfully requested.

#### **Interview**

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the courteous telephone interview conducted on May 4, 2004, during which time Claim 22 and the Moore patent were discussed.

The Applicant discussed the construction of the spool 20 of Moore which was cited as providing the first gripper. But the first gripper is further defined as "engaging the strand of material at a first, constant radius." By definition, the strands on a spool are engaged at a variable radius which decreases as the strands leave the spool.

Further, Claim 22 defines a first and second gripper with the second gripper downstream of the first. A brake is on the first gripper and a brake is between the first and second gripper. The Examiner cites brake 33 and also cites the embodiment of Figure 10 which shows a brake on the first gripper. But, as also discussed during the phone interview, Figure 10 shows an alternative embodiment to brake 33, and is used only in lieu of the brake. Col. 17-22 ("As an **alternative** to the previously mentioned pretensioner [33] ... a pretensioner configuration in the form of a slipbrake may be installed on the turntable 22") (emphasis added); Col. 23, lines 14-19 ("the previously discussed slipbrake utilized on a turntable 22 can be employed **in lieu** of the wire tensioning assembly 33") (emphasis added).

Reconsideration and allowance of Claim 22, and dependent Claims 23-29, is respectfully requested.

#### **Section 119 & Claim 29**

Claim 29 was objected to as lacking antecedent basis for several two claim terms. Those terms are deleted. Withdrawal of the § 119 rejection of Claim 29 is respectfully requested.